

## **C. REMARKS**

### ***Status of Claims***

Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-20, and 22-23 are currently pending in the application. Claims 7, 9, 16, and 22 are amended and claims 8, 15 and 21 are canceled.

### ***Entry of Amendment After Final***

Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to claims 7, 9, 16, and 22 under 37 CFR 1.116(b)(2), which allows that “an amendment presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal may be admitted” after a final rejection. In particular, Applicants amend claims 7, 9, 16, and 22 to correct typographical errors which led to a rejection of these claims under 112, second paragraph. By correcting the typographical errors, Applicants overcome the rejection under 112, second paragraph, and therefore present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal, prior to filing a notice of appeal.

In particular, the Examiner rejects claims 7, 9, 16, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. [Final Office Action, p. 2]

As to claim 7, the Examiner states: “Claim 7 recites the limitation “at the web retailer”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.” [Final Office Action, p. 2] Applicants amend claim 7 to read “at the web server retailer”. Applicants note that there is sufficient antecedent basis for this limitation of “web server” throughout claim 7. In particular, when amending claim 7 in the response dated February 21, 2006, Applicants amended claim 7 to include the element of a “web server” and it is merely a typographical error that in one instance of adding the element of a “web server”, Applicants inadvertently referred to a “web retailer” instead of a “web server”. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter claim 7, as amended to correct a typographical error, and as a result, removing the limitation with insufficient antecedent basis and presenting claim 7 in better form for consideration on appeal.

As to claim 9, the Examiner states: “Claim 9 is a dependent claim of claim 7 and inherits the same deficiency. Furthermore, claim 9 recites the limitation “The method of claim 8.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.” [Final Office Action, p. 2] First, Applicants have amended claim 7 to remove the limitation with insufficient antecedent basis and therefore, as a dependent claim of claim 7, claim 9 no longer inherits the same deficiency as claim 7. Second, Applicants amend claim 9 so that claim 9 is dependent upon claim 7, instead of dependent upon claim 8. Applicants note that when amending the claims in the response dated February 21, 2006, Applicants cancelled claim 8, which was dependent upon claim 7, but inadvertently did not adjust claim 9 to be dependent upon claim 7. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter claim 9, as amended to correct a typographical error, and thus remove the insufficient antecedent basis of the limitation and present claim 9 in better form for consideration on appeal.

As to claim 16, the Examiner states: “Claim 16 recites the limitation “The computer system of claim 15.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.” [Final Office Action, p. 2] Applicants amend claim 16 so that claim 16 is dependent upon claim 14, instead of dependent upon claim 15. Applicants note that when amending the claims in the response dated February 21, 2006, Applicants cancelled claim 15, which was dependent upon claim 14, but inadvertently did not adjust claim 16 to be dependent upon claim 14. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter claim 16, as amended to correct a typographical error, and thus remove the insufficient antecedent basis of the limitation and present claim 16 in better form for consideration on appeal.

As to claim 22, the Examiner states: “Claim 22 recites the limitation “The computer program of claim 21.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.” [Final Office Action, p. 2] Applicants amend claim 22 so that claim 22 is dependent upon claim 20, instead of dependent upon claim 21. Applicants note that when amending the claims in the response dated February 21, 2006, Applicants cancelled claim 21, which was dependent upon claim 20, but inadvertently did not adjust claim 22 to be dependent upon claim 20. Applicants respectfully request that the

Examiner enter claim 22, as amended to correct a typographical error, and thus remove the insufficient antecedent basis of the limitation and present claim 22 in better form for consideration on appeal.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims are respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Amy J. Pattillo', with a stylized, flowing script.

ON 8/1/2006

AMY J. PATTILLO  
Registration No. 46,983  
P.O. BOX 161327  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78716  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS  
Telephone: 512-402-9820